



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/754,891	01/05/2001	Steven D. Ims	RSW920000077US	4751
58505 7590 07/21/2009 STEVENS & SHOWALTER, L.L.P. BOX IBM 7019 CORPORATE WAY DAYTON, OH 45459-4238			EXAMINER RIES, LAURIE ANNE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/21/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte: STEVEN D. IMS, YONGCHENG LI.,
and YIH-SHIN TAN

Application No. 09/754,891
Technology Center 2100

Mailed: July 21, 2009

Before LAWRENCE J. BANKS *Paralegal Specialist*.
BANKS, *Paralegal Specialist*.

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on August 14, 2008. A review of the application revealed that it is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the

application is herewith being returned to the Examiner to address the following matter(s) requiring attention prior to docketing.

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED UPON APPEAL

A review of the file finds that the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal of the claims as provided in the Examiner's Answer mailed <June 26, 2007, under the heading "Grounds of rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal" is either unclear or is not consistent with the grounds of rejection of claims set forth in the last Office action of record. The grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal as provided in the Examiner's Answer must be consistent with the last Office action of record, including any Advisory action responsive to any after final submissions. Furthermore, the examiner must provide a clear statement of whether examiner agrees or disagrees with the statement of grounds of rejection to be reviewed as set forth in the brief and an explanation of any disagreement. *See also Manual of Patent Examining Procedure* (MPEP) § 1207.02 (8th ed. Rev. 6, Sept 2007) for details.

A review of the Examiner's Answer finds that it is unclear what rejected claims are on appeal as compared to the Appeal Brief and/or the

Examiner's Answer does not clearly address differences between rejections set forth in the Examiner's Answer and those addressed in the brief.

Clarification of the record is required for all Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal for all claims.

EXAMINER'S CONSIDERATION OF REPLY BRIEF

A Reply Brief was filed in this application on August 24, 2007. There is no evidence on the record indicating that the Examiner has considered the Reply Brief in accordance with 37 CFR CFR § 41.43(a)(1) and MPEP § 1208, part II.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the application is returned to the Examiner:

- 1) to vacate the Examiner's Answer mailed June 26, 2007;
- 2) to generate a new Examiner's Answer setting forth the correct Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal and to correct other sections of the Answer as may be required;
- 3) and to include the approval of the TC Director or his/her designee (as required for any new grounds of rejection);

4) to consider the Reply Brief filed August 24, 2007, as indicated above; and

5) for such further action as may be appropriate.

If there are any questions pertaining to this Order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

STEVENS & SHOWALTER, L.L.P.
BOX IBM
7019 CORPORATE WAY
DAYTON OH 45459-4238